REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 25 remain at issue. Claims 8-24 have been withdrawn without prejudice to filing a divisional application.

Claim 2 has been amended to further define the "slant" as surrounding the first birdlime. Since it is now clear that the slant of Claim 2 refers to the same slant structure referred to in Claim 1, the rejection of Claim 2 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Claims 1,2,7 and 25 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as clearly anticipated by Andric 4,709,504 ('504).

It is submitted that the '504 patent neither discloses nor suggests applicants claimed "vertical section" as amended, to vertically extend from an end of the inclined plane 230 to the plate 200 (see Fig. 2) and the "second birdlime" 214 adhered onto the vertical section.

As set forth throughout applicant's specification, the second birdlime 214 adhered to the vertical section extends vertically from the slant to the plate and is extremely important to prevent the cockroaches from escaping from the trap. As set forth at pages 6 and 8 of the application's specification:

> [0050] The slant 230 functions so as to make it easy for cockroaches to enter the inside of the trap, but to difficult to escape.
>
> [0054] In relation to the birdlime, in a preferred embodiment of the invention, the first birdlime 212 is placed between the slants 230 on the plate 200, while the second birdlime 214 is placed on the vertical section 234 of the slant 230 (refer to Fig. 2 & Fig. 5). The second birdlime 214 is attached on the vertical section 234 of the slant 230 by using a two-sided adhesive tape. By attaching the second birdlime 214 on the vertical section 234 of the slant 230, the escape of the cockroaches that entered the first birdlime 212, which are trying to escape by going over the vertical section 234 of the slant 230, can be prevented. Also, when the cockroach enters the trap 290 with a part of its body lying on the slant 230, its body or the legs could get caught on the second birdlime, which results in an increase of the capture rate. For instance, a cockroach climbing the inclined plane 232 of the slant 230 tends to hesitate at the crest of the inclined plane 232. Accordingly, the body of the cockroach may not entirely enter the first birdlime 212 but partly lies over the vertical section 234. For example,

> only two of the cockroach's six legs could be stuck on the first birdlime 212. In such case, as the second birdlime 214 is attached to the vertical section 234 of the slant 230, a part of the cockroach is caught by the second birdlime 213, thus improving the capture rate." (emphasis added)

Andric's vertical section 61 neither extends vertically from the end 65 of the slant (between 64 and 65), nor does the vertical section contain a second birdlime adhered thereto. As set forth above, it is important that the second birdlime on applicant's vertical section is disposed on the vertical that extends from an end of the inclined plane to the plate to catch a cockroach which only partly enters the trap (e.g., legs caught on the vertical near the end of the slant – thereby increasing the capture rate). Further, it is submitted that Andric's lateral edges 18 of if a contacting 61 cannot function as applicant's claimed second birdlime since the lateral edges 18a are blocked from being exposed by vertical section 61, and are part of the birdlime 18a (not a separate element, as claimed herein by applicant).

It is submitted, therefore, that the rejection under 35 USC §102 should be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 6 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andric ('504). For the reasons set forth above in applicant's rebuttal of the 35 USC §102 rejection, it is submitted that the rejection under 35 USC §103(a) also should be withdrawn.

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Andric ('504) in view of Katsuda 3,940,874 ('874). It is submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the same reasons set forth above in rebuttal of the 35 USC §102 rejection. Katsuda '874 neither discloses nor suggests a second birdlime on a vertical section extending from an end of the inclined place to the plate, as now defined in all of applicant's elected claims.

Claims 1-3, 6, 7 and 25 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Andric ('504) in view of Brunette 4,876,823 ('823) or Otterson 4,244,134 ('134). In addition to the remarks presented in response to the 35 USC §102 rejection, it should be noted that Brunetti ('823) fails to disclose an element corresponding to the "slant" of applicant's claimed invention. Accordingly, a vertical "wall (62, 66)" of Brunetti does not serve the same function as the 'vertical section' claimed herein.

Further, a top of a "trap" of Brunetti is closed, and thus, a cockroach cannot fall. The "adhesive material" coating the "wall (62, 66)" of Brunetti is merely for broadening a capturing area, whereas, the "second birdlime" of applicant's claimed invention, adhering to the "vertical section" decreases an escape rate of cockroaches that have **fallen down into the trap** from applicant's defined slant, thereby increasing the capture rate.

Accordingly, Brunetti fails to disclose the "slant" including the "vertical section" that causes the cockroach to fall and decreases the escape rate of the fallen cockroach. It is submitted, therefore, that the claimed invention is not obvious over a combination of Andric ('504) and Brunetti ('823).

Further, with reference to Otterson ('134), Otterson also fails to disclose elements corresponding to the "slant", as claimed by applicant, and its important claimed relationship to the second birdlime, as described above. Accordingly, a "sidewall (54, 58)" of Otterson does not serve the same function as the "vertical section" claimed herein by applicant.

Since a trap of Otterson does not include an "inclined plane" where the cockroach comes up, the cockroach may not fall. Also, the "adhesive material (68)" on "sidewall (54)" is merely to broaden an adhesive area. Conversely, the present invention includes a "slant" and "second birdlime" which causes the cockroach to fall and to increase the capture rate of the fallen cockroach.

Otterson fails to disclose the "slant" including the "vertical section" that makes the cockroach fall and increases the capture rate of the fallen cockroach. Accordingly, it is submitted that the claimed invention is not obvious over a combination of Andric ('504) and Otterson ('134).

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Andric ('504) in view of Brunetti ('823) or Otterson ('134) and further in view of Katsuda ('874).

For the reasons set forth above with reference to each of applied prior art references, it is submitted that none of the applied prior art discloses or suggests applicant's claimed structure of a second birdlime extending from applicant's slant (trap entrance), vertically to

the plate of the first birdlime. Since this claimed structure provides an increased cockroach retention rate, as explained in applicant's specification, it is submitted that the rejection under 35 USC §103(a) should be withdrawn.

It is submitted that all elected claims are now of proper form and scope for allowance. Early and favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Dated: March 24, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Richard H. Anderson/

Richard H. Anderson
Registration No.: 26,526
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicant